

## REMARKS

Claims 1-50 are pending in this application. All of the pending claims were rejected. Claims 1, 9, 17 and 47 are currently amended. Reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1, 2, 5-10, 13-18, 21-24, 30, 31, 37, 38, 44, 45, 49 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Gfeller (6,424,442) in view of Doucet (6,348,986) and further in view of Dewberry (6,507,425). Of these claims, 1, 9 and 17 are independent claims which focus on the transmitter in a system where multiple copies of a signal are transmitted to a receiver device in different non-overlapping directions, and received at different points in time. For the reasons stated below, Applicant respectfully traverses.

With regard to the limitation of transmitting multiple copies of the signal in different non-overlapping directions to the remote device currently recited in claims 1, 9 and 17, the Examiner relies upon Gfeller and Doucet. Gfeller teaches physical transceiver modules configured to emit light rays in different overlapping directions. Those light rays collectively constitute only a single omni-directional light beam, and are therefore unsuitable for transmitting multiple copies of a signal in non-overlapping directions to a remote device. Each of the Figures of Gfeller shows overlapping transmission of rays in an omni-directional pattern. Even Fig. 13C which is labeled “directional” is described at column 7, lines 5-46 as having relatively increased range in some directions relative to others, i.e., it is an omni-directional transmitter with power varying based on direction. Therefore, Gfeller fails to teach the “non-overlapping directions” limitation currently recited in independent claims 1, 9 and 17.

Doucet shows cones of focus for transmissions, but this feature alone is not what is claimed as novel. The claims recite transmitting via cones in cones of focus of different non-overlapping directions to the remote device, i.e., the same receiver device. Doucet explicitly

states that the directional antennas are used to support transmission to “multiple independent destinations.”<sup>1</sup> Although it was already clear that the remote device received both copies, claims 1, 9 and 17 have been amended to emphasize this limitation. Withdrawal of the rejections of independent claims 1, 9 and 17 based on Gfeller in view of Doucet and further in view of Dewberry<sup>2</sup> is requested. The dependent claims which were rejected based on the same combination of references are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Claims 3, 11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Gfeller in view of Doucet and further in view of Dewberry, and further in view of Ota (5,986,790). Claims 4, 12 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Gfeller in view of Doucet and further in view of Dewberry, and further in view of Rutledge (5,864,625). Each of these dependent claims is allowable for the same reasons as the independent claims.

Claims 25-29, 32-36, 39-43 and 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Gfeller in view of Doucet. Of the rejected claims, 25, 32 and 39 are independent claims focused on the receiver in a system where multiple copies of a signal are transmitted to a receiver device in different directions, and received at different points in time. The Examiner at least concedes that Gfeller fails to teach receiving the copies at different points in time. However, the Examiner relies upon Doucet as teaching this limitation. Applicant respectfully traverses. The passages of Doucet cited by the Examiner fail to mention anything at all about receiving different copies of a signal at different points in time. The Examiner concludes that “one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since allowing increasing the amount of light collected and supplied to the photodetector.” Applicant does not see what

---

<sup>1</sup> Doucet at column 15, lines 55-59

<sup>2</sup> Note that although Dewberry shows synchronizing, it is not for the purpose recited in the claims

possible connection this might have to the claimed invention. Applicant has never asserted that insufficient light collection was a problem overcome by the claimed invention. It should be clear from the specification and claims that two or more independently received poor copies of the signal can be combined to provide a single good copy, but since those copies are received at different points in time there is no additive light collection effect at the receiver. Because the cited combination fails to teach receiving the copies at different points in time, and further fails to teach using those copies to reconstruct the original signal, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 25, 32, 39 and 47 is requested. The dependent claims which were rejected based on the same combination of references are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. Should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

August 15, 2007  
Date

/Holmes W. Anderson/  
Holmes Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
McGuinness & Manaras LLP  
125 Nagog Park  
Acton, MA 01720  
(978) 264-4001

Docket No. 120-168  
Dd: 7/17/2007